

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAY 23 2007****KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP**

315 S. Beverly Drive, Suite 210
Beverly Hills, California 90212

Telephone: (310) 556-7983
Facsimile: (310) 556-7984

FAX COVER SHEET**PLEASE DELIVER THIS FACSIMILE
TO EXAMINER CHUCK O. KENDALL**

TO: Commissioner for Patents
Attn: Examiner Chuck O. Kendall
Group Art Unit: 2192

FROM: William K. Konrad
OUR REF: 0054.0033
TELEPHONE: 310-556-7983

Total pages, including cover letter: 3

PTO FAX NUMBER: 1-571-273-8300

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 310-556-7983, or fax us at 310-556-7984.

Description of Documents Transmitted:

**APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW
REQUEST FORM**

Applicant: H.J. GLASER et al.
Serial No.: 09/687,033
Filed: October 12, 2000
Group Art Unit: 2192
Docket No.: STL920000062US1

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to Examiner Chuck O. Kendall of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on May 23, 2007.


William K. Konrad

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 23 2007

PTOL-413A
0054.0033

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/687,033

First Named Application: H.J. GLASER et al.Examiner: Chuck O. KendallArt Unit: 2192 Status of Application: Nonfinal rejection

Tentative Participants:

(1) William K. Konrad(2) Chuck O. Kendall

(3) _____

(4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: May 29, 2007

Proposed Time: 02:00 PM (Eastern)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit to be shown or demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide a brief description: _____

Issues to be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>Claims 8 and 14</u>	<u>Downs and Kenner</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

Proposed amendment to claim 8 is attached. Downs and Kenner do not make obvious operation of "building the application program in a configuration customized to conform to the user application program installation configuration decrypted from the manifest file" as required by claim 8 amended as proposed.

An Interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This Application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

William Konrad 28,868
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 23 2007

PTOL-413A
0054.0033

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/687,033
Examiner: Chuck O. Kendall

First Named Application: H.J. GLASER et al.
Art Unit: 2192 Status of Application: Nonfinal rejection

Tentative Participants:

(1) William K. Konrad
(3) _____

(2) Chuck O. Kendall
(4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: May 29, 2007

Proposed Time: 02:00 PM (Eastern)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit to be shown or demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide a brief description: _____

Issues to be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>Claims 8 and 14</u>	<u>Downs and Kenner</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

Proposed amendment to claim 8 is attached. Downs and Kenner do not make obvious operation of "building the application program in a configuration customized to conform to the user application program installation configuration decrypted from the manifest file" as required by claim 8 amended as proposed.

An Interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This Application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

William Konrad 28,868
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)